

### A Machine Learning Approach to SDOH Indices: Optimizing Predictive Power for Health Outcomes

Chandler McClellan, Patricia Keenan, Thomas Selden, Thomas Buchmueller 10/24/2024 – FCSM

#### Disclaimer



The views expressed in this presentation are those of the authors, and no official endorsement by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality is intended or should be inferred.

#### **SDOH Indices**



- Seek to summarize a given area's Social Determinants of Health
- Used for policy development, resource allocation, research, community health assessment, risk stratification, etc.
- Examples:
  - Area Deprivation Index (ADI) Mortality w.r.t. Deprivation
  - Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) Disaster response
  - Social Deprivation Index (SDI) Triple Aim (costs, care, health)
  - Child Opportunity Index (COI) Children's development

#### **Current approaches to indices**



- Select Variables
- Reorient/Normalize/Percentiles
- Calculate Index
  - Sum
  - Principal Component Analysis
    - Take first PC as index
      - Linear combination of variables that captures most variation
  - Factor Analysis
    - Linear combination of variables that captures common variation
  - Targeted prediction
    - Predicted value is the index value
- Validate to show index is related to outcomes of interest

#### **Potential Pitfalls**



- May leave out important variables (or include unimportant ones)
- Sensitive to data handling choices
- Often linear and may fail to capture important relationships in the data
- May not be related to outcomes of interest
- Often validated on modeled outcomes
  - Area level estimates of outcomes often modeled using SDOH

#### **Our Approach**



- Ensures index is related to outcomes
- Census Tract SDOH used in the ADI (16) AHRQ SDOH database
- Outcomes: Priority Conditions, Access, Expenditure MEPS data
- Use a neural network framework to encode SDOH in a single value
  - Data driven variable selection
  - Captures complex relationships Universal function approximator
  - Multiple outcomes
- Use individual level data to build and validate model

#### An Encoding Approach for Indices





	AHRQ SDOH	ADI						
	% <100 FPL							
	% <125 FPL	% <150% FPL						
	Ln(% <\$10k / % >\$50k )							
	% Less than HS	% less than 9 <sup>th</sup> grad						
	% White Collar							
2S —	% Unemployed							
	% Single Parent							
	% Owner Occupied							
	% Over-crowded							
	% No Vehicle							
	% No Plumbing							
	%No Computer	% No Phone						
	Home Value							
	Income							
	Mortgage payment							
	Rent payment							

# SDOH Measures Census Tract

#### MEPS Indices – Individual Level (Census Tracts)



- Targets Individual Health Related Outcomes
  - Five Priority Conditions: Chronic Heart Disease, High BP, High Cholesterol, Stroke, Diabetes (5)
  - Full set of Priority Conditions (12)
  - Access Measures: No Usual source of care, Cost a barrier to Medical Care/Dental Care/Rx access (4)
  - Total Medical Expenditures (1)
- Architecture
  - "Encoder" 3 layers: nodes {70,30,1} with regularization
  - "Decoder" Linear/logit regression
- Construct Index using 66% of MEPS individuals from 2009-2020
- Hold out 33% for validation and testing
  - No overlapping census tracts
- Compare to ADI
  - Publicly available ADI may not be accurate. Also assess a community deprivation index (CDI)

#### **Evaluation**

- Estimate predictive model in training data
  - $\blacktriangleright Y_i = \alpha + \beta * Index_i + \epsilon$
- Predict outcomes in test data •  $\widehat{Y}_i = \widehat{\alpha} + \widehat{\beta} * Index_i$
- Marginalize prediction over actual outcome values.



Difference in Predictions between those With and Without Condition Relative to Mean – Chronic Condition Targets



	ADI	CDI	Chronic Condition	Full	Access	Expenditure
Chronic Heart Disease	3.236	0.787	8.323	<mark>8.559</mark>	-0.024	2.09
Diabetes	4.329	4.404	<mark>4.702</mark>	4.336	1.227	0.829
High BP	2.836	1.006	<mark>5.482</mark>	5.459	-0.016	1.208
High Chol.	0.077	0.108	<mark>1.916</mark>	1.737	0.373	0.642
Stroke	6.924	3.674	10.457	<mark>11.115</mark>	0.195	2.651

Difference in Predictions between those With and Without Condition Relative to Mean – Additional Priority Condition Targets



	ADI	CDI	Chronic Condition	Full	Access	Expenditure
Angina	5.567	1.673	11.628	<mark>15.288</mark>	-0.36	2.328
Myocardial Infarction	8.228	2.563	12.035	<mark>14.207</mark>	-0.089	3.446
Other Heart	0.878	0.239	5.171	<mark>7.551</mark>	2.846	4.684
Asthma	0.822	0.622	1.316	2.011	0.101	<mark>4.197</mark>
Emphysema	14.045	3.562	21.166	<mark>29.429</mark>	-0.606	7.014
Arthritis	2.943	0.209	7.520	<mark>9.278</mark>	0.803	3.892
Cancer	0.039	1.500	3.846	<mark>5.053</mark>	3.748	4.773

#### Difference in Predictions between those With and Without Relative to Mean – <u>Access Outcomes</u>



	ADI	CDI	Chronic Condition	Full	Access	Expenditure
No Usual Source of Care	0.601	<mark>2.871</mark>	0.423	1.374	2.488	2.108
Cost Barrier Medical	4.577	4.026	0.329	0.108	<mark>6.121</mark>	0.751
Cost Barrier Dental	4.909	4.574	1.332	0.676	<mark>6.398</mark>	0.397
Cost Barrier Rx	<mark>10.469</mark>	10.084	4.478	2.043	8.892	-0.326

\*Correlation b/t USC and Medical, Dental, and RX Barriers: 0.05, 0.009, 0.003

#### Predicted Mean Expenditure by Actual Expenditure Decile





#### Predicted Adjusted Mean Expenditure by Actual Expenditure Decile





#### Takeaways



- Neural Network Encoders offer a powerful way to summarize many variables
  - Isolates input variation related to outcomes of interest
- Generally better predictions
  - Both targeted outcomes and related outcomes
  - Prediction of distal outcomes can suffer
  - Needs careful consideration about index use
- Tradeoff between prediction power and breadth of targeted outcomes

#### **Potential Extensions**



- Fine-Tuning the encoder
- More encoder input variables
  - Limited for comparison purposes
- More complex "decoder"
  - Non-linearities
  - More index dimensions
- "Decoder" predictors
  - Individual level characteristics

## **Thank You**



#### Questions and Comments: chandler.mcclellan@ahrq.hhs.gov